UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,380	01/26/2001	Shinichi Nojima	1614.1119	5766

21171 7590 03/26/2008

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
TRAN, QUOC A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/769,380	NOJIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quoc A. Tran	2176	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) ☒ The period for reply expires *3* months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: *1-27*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Quoc A. Tran/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176

/William L. Bashore/
William L. Bashore
Primary Examiner
Tech Center 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's amendment after final office action filed on 02/27/2008, has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance.

Beginning on page 10 of 15 of the REMARKS (hereinafter the remarks), Applicant argues the following issues, which are accordingly addressed below.

Applicant argues the "Response to the Arguments" of the Office Action dated 11/27/2007, was not persuasive, because the Examiner stated " Firstly, it is noted that the feature upon which Applicant relies (i.e. "selected after the character string is input" in other word after the character string is defined and finalized) is not recited in the rejected claim. That is, Claim 25 does not recite "selected AFTER the character string is input." Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." See the Office Action dated 11/27/2007 at Page 29 Third Para (see remarks Page 10 Bottom, Page 12 the first four Para.)

For purposes of responding to Applicant's argument, the examiner will assume that Applicant is arguing for the patentability of Claim 25.

The Examiner disagrees. As discuss in the Office Action mailed 11/27/2007, claim 25 of Applicants claimed invention states,

> "25. A method for processing, comprising: receiving a candidate character string input from a user; selecting, by a processor, at least one program while characters of the candidate character string are being input until the input characters of the candidate character string are defined and finalized; and displaying output from the program." - see claim 25 Page 8 of the Paper submitted on 02/27/2008.

Also in the Office Action dated 11/27/2007, Onishi discloses an input unit 1 to which a natural conversational sentence in a first language, or a source language, is entered freely by the user, an analyzer 2, a semantic searcher 3 and a display unit 4 for displaying the result from unit 1, (See, Onishi Fig. 1 and also col. 16 lines 35-60), Also, see Onishi col. 80, line 61, teaching automaton processor, which scans the whole input character string, to search for specific character strings. This interpretation is supported by Applicant's Specification, which states, "candidates formed by one or more undefined characters are successively displayed and one desired candidate is selected by the user" at Page 18 Lines 5-10; thus Onishi is clearly anticipated all limitation of claim 25.

In addition, it is noted on Page 29 of the Office Action dated 11/27/2007 Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Onishi et al. US006154720A- filed Jun. 13, 1996. That is, Claim 25 does not recite any "search request" as alleged by the Applicants at Page 10 the Fourth Para of the remarks dated 02/27/2008. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)."

Thus the Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e), as being anticipated by Onishi, at least at this times;

In addition, the Applicant argues against the rejection Claims 1-24, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Doi , in view of Onishi , because of similar reason as set forth in the response to the remarks to claim 25 as cited above (see the above response to claim 25 for details), and also because of the similar reason as cited in the remarks filed 11/27/2007, which were addressed each and every one argument in details in the Office Action dated 11/27/2007 at Pages 29-37 (see Office Action dated 11/27/2007 Page 29-37 fort details).

Thus the Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection of claims 1-24 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable by Doi, in view of Onishi at least at this times.

Accordingly, for at least all the above evidence, Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection of claims 1-27 at this time..